

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13 and 15-23 are pending in the present application. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 22 and 23 and cancels Claims 24-26. No new matter is introduced.¹

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4-10, 15-20, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Matsushima (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0144257); Claims 2, 11, 13, 21, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Matsushima in view of Washino (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,157).

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, 15-20, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Matsushima, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites,

An image forming apparatus that includes service modules for performing system side processes on image formation, wherein applications can be added to the image forming apparatus separately from the service modules, the image forming apparatus comprising:

an application launch part configured to access launch selection information, the launch selection information indicating at least an auxiliary storage device that stores one or more applications from among a plurality of kinds of auxiliary storage devices, and configured to launch the one or more applications from the auxiliary storage device according to the accessed launch selection information; and

a part configured to display a setting screen that sets the launch selection information on a display part of the image forming apparatus, and configured to store information input from the setting screen as the launch selection information,

wherein the service modules are stored in a memory distinct from the auxiliary storage device,

wherein the one or more applications are installed in the auxiliary storage device, and

¹ Support for the additions and amendments to the claims can be found, at least, in Figure 5 and corresponding disclosure.

wherein the application launch part launches the one or more applications from the auxiliary storage device by issuing an execution command which is stored in the auxiliary storage device.

Claim 22 recites similar features and Claim 23 recites at least the above noted features.

Matsushima describes a multifunction machine which executes software downloaded into the multifunction machine.

However, Matsushima does not describe or suggest an application launch part configured to access launch selection information, the launch selection information indicating at least an auxiliary storage device that stores one or more applications from among a plurality of kinds of auxiliary storage devices, or that an application launch part launches one or more applications from an auxiliary storage device by issuing an execution command which is stored in the auxiliary storage device.

The outstanding Action appears to assert on page 3 that the claimed “launch selection information” is disclosed in Matsushima as a link (“multifunction machine displays the link on the browser...”). However, Applicants note that the “link” in Matsushima is merely an address for directing the browser to a network location. The “link” of Matsushima does not indicate an auxiliary storage device from among a plurality of kinds of auxiliary storage devices as is recited in Claim 1.

Moreover, the outstanding Action asserts on page 7 that Matsushima discloses that an application launch part launches one or more applications from an auxiliary storage device by issuing an execution command which is stored in the auxiliary storage device. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Specifically, the software component downloaded from server 20 in Matsushima is merely described as being executed. Nothing in Matsushima describes issuing an execution command *which is stored in the auxiliary storage device.*

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, and similarly Claims 22, and claims depending respectfully therefrom, patentably distinguish over Matsushima considered individually or in any combination.

Furthermore, with regard to Claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim patentably distinguishes over Matsushima and Washino considered individually or in combination for at least the reasons noted above with regard to Claim 1 (which also apply to Claim 23), as Washino does not cure the deficiencies of Matsushima with regard to the claimed invention.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13 and 15-23 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

James Love
Registration No. 58,421

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)